



	Candles	Mincha	DafYomi	Shiur	Shachris	ש"ש
Friday	8:14	7:00				9:14
Shabbos		1:45/8:09	7:30		9:00	9:15
Sunday		8:15	8:45		8:00	9:15

IMPORTANCE OF ...

The Gemara (*Kesubos* 111b) expounds on the use of the word עם (with) in the *Posuk*: שבו לכם פה עם החמור to derive לדומה לחמור – a nation similar to a donkey. Thus, since עם implies similarity, the *GRA* and *Malbim* explain that Hashem was angry with Bilaam for going with the officers of Moav even though Hashem had given him permission, because Hashem had told him לך אתם where אתם does not imply an equality or similarity of mind and purpose, but the *Posuk* describes Bilaam's departure with the words: וילך בלעם עם שרי מואב where use of the word עם does have that implication of equivalence, particularly after Hashem had told him initially לא תלך עמהם – do not go with them, i.e. with a similar purpose. Even the *Posuk* עם לבן גרתי could be explained, not to establish an equivalence between Yaakov and Lavan, but to equate Yaakov's ability to connive as effectively as Lavan. However, the *Tosafos Yeshanim* (*Yoma* 85b) cites a *Machlokes* between Rabbeinu Tam and R' Elchanan regarding the *Mishna* (*Avos* 2:2): יפה תלמוד תורה עם דרך ארץ where Rabbeinu Tam holds that דרך ארץ is the עיקר (primary) since it is being added to, and תלמוד תורה is טפל (secondary) to it. R' Elchanan disagreed, citing the next few words in the *Mishna*: וכל תורה שאין עמה מלאכה to establish that תלמוד תורה is the עיקר. According to both opinions, it would seem that עם does not imply an equivalence, but rather the opposite. The *Birkei Yosef* (*אור"ח* 423:3) distinguishes within *Nusach Sfar'd's Musaf* קדושה between *Shabbos* and *Yom Tov*, where מלאכים המוני מעלה עם עמך ישראל is said, which reflects the superiority of עמך ישראל over the מלאכים for *Shabbos* and *Yom Tov* (based on a *Midrash*), versus *Musaf* on *Rosh Chodesh* when the *minhag* was to say עמך ישראל instead of עמך ישראל where there was no clear primacy of *Bnei Yisroel* over the *Malochim*.

QUESTION OF THE WEEK:

When is it permitted to drink the milk of a cow, but not the milk of its calf ?

ANSWER TO LAST WEEK:

(Who can borrow and not have to pay it back ?)

The *Shulchan Aruch* (*אורח"ח* 86:2) rules that if a husband borrows money from his wife, even if he divorces her, he need not pay it back because we assume that it falls into the general rule that what she acquires belongs to him. The *Rambam* (*מלוה ולוה* 2:8) allows her to prove that the money came from her נדוניה, and adds that the same law would apply where one borrows from his *Eved Canaani*.

DIN'S CORNER:

One should לכתחילה say *Kiddush Levanah* on *Motzai Shabbos* when he is dressed and groomed appropriately. If *Motzai Shabbos* will be after the 10th day of the month, he should not wait, but rather he should say it as soon as possible for fear that several days may be too cloudy to see the moon. One should wait at least until 3 days have gone by, measured from the *Molad*. (*אור"ח* 426)

DID YOU KNOW THAT ...

The Gemara (*Sanhedrin* 82a) states that Pinchas, while pursuing Zimri, was a *Rodef*, and as such, if Zimri (or someone else) had turned around in self-defense and killed Pinchas, he would not be liable for doing so. At the same time, the Gemara states, if Zimri had stopped sinning and Pinchas then killed him, Pinchas would be liable. The *Meforshim* raise the following question: The Gemara (*ibid* 74a) states that if someone is being pursued and it is possible for him, in his own defense, to disable his pursuer (e.g. by injuring him) then he has no right to kill the pursuer. If so, when Zimri was being pursued by Pinchas, did not Zimri have an opportunity to save himself without having to kill Pinchas in self-defense, simply by stopping what he was doing, which would in turn stop Pinchas from pursuing him ? The *Tzafnas Paneach* (*איסורי ביאה* 12:5) suggests that a sinner such as Zimri can sometimes be so caught up in an *aveirah* that he is considered an אונס and it is beyond his control to suddenly stop, even when threatened by a *Rodef*. However, the *Minchas Shlomo* (1:7) questions this since, if Zimri would have been able to turn around and kill Pinchas, then at least for that brief moment he will have stopped his sinning, which would have the effect of turning off Pinchas' pursuit. As such, Zimri should not have had the right described in the Gemara, to kill Pinchas. Therefore, the *Minchas Shlomo* suggests that a *Nirdaf* (one who is pursued) is never obligated to just stop what he is doing because someone else (i.e. the *Rodef*) wants him to, even where what he is doing is an *aveirah*. As such, Zimri was under no obligation to "give in" and allow Pinchas' will to dominate his own. This is apparent from the *Mishna LaMelech* (*רוצה* 1:15) who notes that when a *Rodef* kills a would-be rescuer who tries to stop him, the *Rodef* is liable because the would-be rescuer has a חיוב to step in and save the *Nirdaf*. On the other hand, where a *Rodef* such as Pinchas undertakes to pursue and execute a sinner such as Zimri under the rule קנאין פוגעין בו, such an undertaking is only רשות (permitted) for Pinchas, so if Zimri turns around and kills Pinchas he is not liable. The *Minchas Shlomo* understands this to mean that if a *Rodef* seeks to prevent a *Nirdaf* from eating non-kosher food by killing him, if the *Nirdaf* defends himself and kills the *Rodef*, he is not liable because the *Rodef* had no right to kill him, and the *Nirdaf* was not obligated to de-fuse the situation by stopping.

A Lesson Can Be Learned From:

A bochur approached R' Yechezkel Levinstein and said that his father was very sick. He wanted to accept upon himself to do things as a *Zechus* for a *Refuah*. R' Chazkel advised him to be careful to choose something that he was sure he could fulfill. To do otherwise was not appropriate and if he didn't fulfill it, he would accomplish nothing for his father. R' Chazkel said that the best thing would be to do something to be מוכה the *Tzibur*, so he should arrange to give a Gemara Shiur. "What if I can't do that ?" the bochur asked. R' Chatzkel told him to give a Shiur in *Kitzur*. "And if I can't do that either ?" R' Chatzkel replied "Then you should commit to straightening out the chairs and benches in the *Beis Medrash*. That too is a יצוי הרבים".

P.S. *Sholosh Seudos* sponsored this week by the Sternberg family.

This issue is dedicated:

לד"ר אבי מורי הרב אהרן זאב ב"ר שמואל ז"ל

Dedications (\$18) and appreciations may be sent to: Kehilas Prozdor, 8 GreenHill Lane, Spring Valley, N.Y. 10977 (845) 354-7240

As this contains *Divrei Torah* and partial *Pesukim*, it should be treated with proper respect, both during and after use

ולד"ר שמואל ב"ר גדלי' יוסף ולד"ר פערל ב"ר יצחק הלוי ולד"ר אברהם ב"ר יעקב חיים